

Appl. No. 10/626,892  
Response to Office Action mailed Jun. 15, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 12 2006

Atty Dkt. No. 114951-011

### REMARKS

The non-final Office Action was issued on pending claims 1-43. Claims 1-5, 9-11, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24-36 and 38 stand rejected, claims 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22 and 23 were objected to, and claims 6-8, 37 and 39-43 stand withdrawn from consideration. In this Response, claims 1-3, 9, 10 and 27-29 have been amended, no claims have been added, and claims 4, 5, 7, 11-26 and 30-43 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-3, 6, 8-10 and 27-29 are pending in the application with claims 1-3, 9, 10 and 27-29 under consideration and claims 6 and 8 withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call Applicants' Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

### Examiner Interview and Amendments

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courteous telephone interview on September 5, 2006. As discussed during the interview, the claims have been amended to pertain to a mold having the veneer (mold shim) on the pedestal having the magnets. The claims no longer pertain to the mold shim alone.

As also discussed during the interview, the term "mold shim" in the claims has been changed to "veneer." Applicants submit the application as originally filed supports use of the term "veneer." Referring to Figs. 1-3, the mold shim 10 is a layer of material, which may be flat and may have a strip-like shape. The mold shim 10 is permanently adhered to the top of the pedestal 14. See the specification at page 10, lines 1-4 and page 12, lines 7-8. Thus, the term "veneer" instead of the term "mold shim" is supported by the application as originally filed and is not new matter. The specification has been amended to be consistent with the use of the term "vencer" in the claims.

The title of the patent application has been amended to be consistent with the amended claims.

Appl. No. 10/626,892  
Response to Office Action mailed Jun. 15, 2006

Atty Dkt. No. 114951-011

One example of Applicants' invention, as claimed in claim 1, is shown in Figs. 1-3. A mold 13 has a pedestal 14 protruding from a mold surface toward an interior of the mold 13. A plurality of magnets 15 are located at a top surface of the pedestal 14. A veneer 10 is located at the top surface of the pedestal 14, and the veneer 10 is permanently adhered to the pedestal 14 and covers the plurality of magnets 15. The veneer 10 has an exposed outer surface (surface facing the fastener strip 11) which has a substantially smoother contour than the top surface of the pedestal 14 at the magnets 15. See the specification at page 10, lines 1-4; page 10, line 16 – page 11, line 16; and page 12, lines 7-8. The reference numbers inserted into the claim text are for reference purposes to the examples of Applicants' invention and are not intended to limit the claim.

Applicants submit pending claims 1-3, 9, 10 and 27-29 and withdrawn claims 6 and 8 are allowable.

#### **Claim Objections**

In the Office Action at paragraph 15, claims 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22 and 23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but noted as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the notice of allowable claims.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102, §103**

In the Office Action at paragraph 4, claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 18, 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pollard et al. (US 5,766,385). In the Office Action at paragraph 5, claims 1, 2, 5, 9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Oborny et al. (US 5,766,723). In the Office Action at paragraph 6, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mabee (US 5,603,395). In the Office Action at paragraph 7, claims 1, 27-29, 31-35 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Banfield (US 5,786,061). In the Office Action at paragraph 8, claims 1, 2 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa et al. (US 4,842,916). In

Appl. No. 10/626,892  
Response to Office Action mailed Jun. 15, 2006

Atty Dkt. No. 114951-011

the Office Action at paragraph 9, claims 1, 10, 11, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Billarant (US 6,148,487). In the Office Action at paragraph 10, claims 31, 32, 36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cloutier et al. (US 2002/0066976). In the Office Action at paragraph 14, claims 24-26 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Billarant in view of Di Pinto (US 3,127,457).

Pending claim 1 and pending dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 27-29 have been amended to pertain to a mold. Applicants submit the claims are clearly allowable over the references relied on in the Office Action. None of the references have a mold which has a pedestal protruding from a mold surface toward an interior of the mold; a plurality of magnets located at a top surface of the pedestal; and a veneer located at the top surface of the pedestal, the veneer permanently adhered to the pedestal and covering the plurality of magnets; wherein the veneer has an exposed outer surface having a substantially smoother contour than the top surface of the pedestal.

Thus, Applicants submit that the §102 and §103 rejections should be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

EVEREST INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP

Date: September 12, 2006

BY



Michael S. Leonard, Reg. No. 37,557  
P.O. Box 708  
Northbrook, IL 60065  
Phone: (847) 272-3400